1 2 3	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS, SCSBN 9990 United States Attorney JOANN M. SWANSON, CSBN 88143 Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Civil Division		
4	EDWARD A. OLSEN, CSBN 214150 Assistant United States Attorney		
5	450 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor		
6	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6915 FAX: (415) 436-6927		
7	Email: edward.olsen@usdoj.gov		
8	Attorneys for Respondents		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN JOSE I	DIVISION	*E-FILED - 8/24/07*
12			
13	PERLITO CAPILI SULIT and ESTELA SULIT,) Case No. C	C 05-0958-RMW
14	Petitioners,		TION TO TRANSFER CASE
15 16	v.		UNITED STATES COURT OF S FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT;
17	MICHAEL CHERTOFF, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, CHARLES DEMORE,))	KDLK
	District Director, Immigration and Customs)	
	Enforcement, NANCY ALCANTAR, Field Office Director, Immigration and Customs)	
	Enforcement, and ALBERTO GONZALES, Attorney General of the United States,))	
20	Respondents.))	
21)	
22	The petitioners filed the above-entitled petition for writ of habeas corpus on March 7, 2005,		
23	alleging, inter alia, that the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA) entry of a deportation order in		
24	the first instance is <i>ultra vires</i> , thereby rendering the BIA's March 26, 1996 deportation order a		
25	nullity.		
26	On November 7, 2005, this Court granted the respondents' unopposed request to hold the case		
27	in abeyance pending resolution of an appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the		
28	Ninth Circuit in <i>Lolong v. Gonzales</i> , No. 03-72384, because the parties anticipated that in that case		
	CTIDILI ATION TO TRANSFER HAREAS CASE TO MINTU	I CIDCIUT COU	DT OE ADDEALS

the Ninth Circuit would address: (1) whether the courts of appeals or the district courts have jurisdiction to review the type of claim that petitioner raises in this action, and (2) whether the BIA acts *ultra vires* when it issues a removal order in the first instance rather than remanding to the Immigration Judge for entry of a removal order after there has been an admission or finding of removability.

The Ninth Circuit issued its decision in *Lolong* on May 7, 2007. In *Lolong*, the Court of

The Ninth Circuit issued its decision in *Lolong* on May 7, 2007. In *Lolong*, the Court of Appeals assumed jurisdiction and rejected the petitioner's argument that the BIA acted *ultra vires* when it entered a removal order in the first instance. *Lolong v. Gonzales*, 484 F.3d 1173 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc). The court held that where "the IJ has previously determined that the alien is removable, but grants cancellation of removal, the BIA's decision to reverse the cancellation of removal reinstates the initial finding of removability, which, under the statute, is effectively an order of removal. *Lolong*, 484 F.3d at 1178.

The respondents believe that *Lolong* disposes of the petitioners' claim that the BIA *acted ultra* vires when it entered the petitioners' March 26, 1996 deportation order. The petitioner believes that *Lolong* is not controlling since the present action involves a different statutory and regulatory scheme in deportation proceedings commenced and completed before the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The parties agree that this case must be transferred to the Ninth Circuit pursuant to the REAL ID Act of 2005, which provides that habeas petitions pending in district courts on the effective date of the Act shall be transferred to the court of appeals to be treated as petitions for review. *See* Pub. L. No. 109-13, § 106(c), 119 Stat. 231, 311 (May 11, 2005); *Puri v. Gonzales*, 464 F.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir. 2006).

The parties agree that, pending the transfer of the proceedings to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and until issuance of notice of docketing of the petition for review, the respondents agree not to deport the petitioners from the United States.

¹The mandate issued on June 29, 2007. STIPULATION TO TRANSFER HABEAS CASE TO NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS C 05-0958-RMW

Case 5:05-cv-00958-RMW Document 23 Filed 08/24/07 Page 3 of 3

1			
2	Dated: August 22, 2007	Respectfully submitted,	
3		SCOTT N. SCHOOLS United States Attorney	
4		Officed States Attorney	
5		/s/ EDWARD A. OLSEN	
6		Assistant United States Attorney	
7			
8	Dated: August 22, 2007	/s/	
9		JAMES TODD BENNETT Attorney for Petitioners	
10			
11			
12		ORDER	
13	Pursuant to stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
14	Date: 8/24/07	Ronald M. Whyte RONALD M. WHYTE	
15			
		United States District Judge	
16		United States District Judge	
17		United States District Judge	
17 18		United States District Judge	
17 18 19		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26		United States District Judge	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		United States District Judge	